

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

REGINA RENEE VANCE,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:17-cv-723

v.

HON. JANET T. NEFF

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff brings this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1383(c)(3), seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration to deny her claim for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this Court affirm the decision of the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) rendered on behalf of the Commissioner. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff's objection to the Report and Recommendation. Defendant filed a response to the objection. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), Plaintiff is entitled to de novo consideration of the portion of the Report and Recommendation to which she objects. The Court denies the objection and issues this Opinion and Order.

The Magistrate Judge set forth the proper standards and thoroughly considered Plaintiff's arguments in light of the record and governing law. In her objection to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, Plaintiff argues that this Court should reject "the Magistrate Judge's finding that the ALJ did not err in weighing the opinions of Drs. Hudson and Findley" (ECF No.

16 at PageID.1031). However, as Defendant points out in response (ECF No. 17 at PageID.1035), Plaintiff’s “objection” to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation merely reiterates the arguments she presented to the Magistrate Judge. Her objection demonstrates her disagreement with the ALJ’s decision, but fails to identify any factual or legal error in the Magistrate Judge’s review. The “purpose [of filing objections] is not served if the district court is required to conduct a complete, de novo review of all of the pleadings that were considered by the magistrate judge.” *Freeman v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 972 F.2d 347, at *2 (6th Cir. 1992). Rather, “[t]he functions of the district court are effectively duplicated as both the magistrate and the district court perform identical tasks.” *Howard v. Sec’y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the Court will deny the objection, adopt the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court, and enter a Judgment consistent with this Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Objection (ECF No. 16) is DENIED, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 15) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court, and the decision of the Commissioner of Social Security is AFFIRMED.

Dated: August 30, 2018

/s/ Janet T. Neff
JANET T. NEFF
United States District Judge